UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/517,323	12/20/2004	Masazumi Nishikawa	263192US0PCT	3573
	7590 05/04/201 AK, MCCLELLAND 1	EXAMINER		
1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			MERCIER, MELISSA S	
ALEAANDRIA	A, VA 22514	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		1615		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/04/2010	ELECTRONIC

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com oblonpat@oblon.com jgardner@oblon.com

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/517,323	NISHIKAWA ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	

	MELISSA S. MERCIER	1615	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED on March 8, 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FO	R ALLOWANCE.	
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apperor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	the same day as filing a Notice of A replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit al (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adno event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejection	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extrumer 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1: ension and the corresponding amount on the tened statutory period for reply origin	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS</li> </ol>	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
<del></del>		20 ( ) ( 4 )	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor	sideration and/or search (see NOT		cause
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett	•	ducing or simplifying th	ne issues for
appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a c	orresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).			
<ol> <li>The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12</li> <li>Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):</li> </ol>		mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	owable if submitted in a separate, t	imely filed amendmer	t canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [ how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		l be entered and an ex	xplanation of
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>18,19,22,25,26 and 39-41</u> .			
Claim(s) rejected. <u>76,79,22,25,26 and 39-41.</u> Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:  AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se	al and/or appellant fails ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1)	s to provide a
10.	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u></li> </ol>	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
	/R Supervisory Patent Exar	obert A. Wax/	
	Supervisory Faterit Exal	inner, Art Offic 1010	

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues:

The prior art does not recognize the patient population to be those "in need thereof" and the prior art also does not recognize the damage is a result of UV light.

The Examiner respectfully disagrees. The prior art recognizes the administration of the same compound for the treatment of burns caused by intensive sunrays, as discussed in the rejection. It is long recognized and accepted the sunburns are caused by ultraviolet rays of the sun (i.e. UV light). Therefore, the disclosure of such treatment meets the limitations of the instant claims.

The prior art is not enabled for treating disorders as a result of UV exposure.

The Examiner again respectfully disagrees. Applicant is reminded that prior art references are presumed to be enabled, absent a showing of evidence to the contrary.

-